

Madrid Republicans Excited.

It may seem at first sight surprising that the Republican Deputies should leave the Cortes in a body and talk of the necessity of revolution because Prime Minister Sagasta has procured the passage of a bill permitting him to defer the municipal election in Madrid. The incident is far from being as insignificant as it looks. It was a question connected with the affairs of the Spanish capital which caused the overthrow of the Canovas Cabinet, and it is in order to avoid a similar stumbling block that the present Liberal Government would postpone an appeal to the ballot box until its partisans are strong enough to acquire control of the municipal administration.

Some months ago it was discovered that, in the application of the city's revenues and in the inflation of its funded debt, the municipal authorities of Madrid had committed frauds comparable in magnitude to those of which New York city was the victim at the hands of Tweed and his accomplices. Señor CANOVAS DEL CASTILLO was Prime Minister at the time, and public opinion held him accountable to a certain extent for the wrongdoing, because he had appointed some of the offenders and had evinced reluctance to proceed against them with rigor. So widespread and bitter was the feeling against him that more than half of his own former supporters, the Conservatives, deserted him, beat him on a vote of censure in the Cortes, and forced him to resign. Strange to say, the Moderates or Liberals, who have for many years accepted the leadership of Señor SAGASTA, took no part in the remarkable division which demolished the CANOVAS Cabinet.

Invited by the Queen Regent to form a Government, SAGASTA, whose former party had a very small minority of the last Cortes, entered into a kind of coalition, not with the honest Conservatives who desired to purge the municipal administration, but with the adherents of CANOVAS, who had endeavored to shield the evildoers. The result was that a large proportion of the Madrid taxpayers looked with as much suspicion on the new Ministry as on the old one, and, at the ensuing general election, supported the Republican candidates, who, accordingly, swept the city. Their success was amazing when one considers the instruments of corruption and intimidation at the disposal of the Spanish Ministry and the unpopularity of the latter. It is foreboding, also, a thorough investigation of the municipal frauds, for there was no reason to doubt that the Republicans would prove as strong in the approaching municipal election as they had in the contest for seats in the Cortes.

That Señor SAGASTA is actuated by the desire to shield evildoers, of which he, like CANOVAS, is accused, seems a fair inference from the step which he has taken. On the pretext that the registration lists of Madrid were grossly defective, and that time would be needed to correct them, the Prime Minister laid before the Cortes a bill authorizing him to order the municipal election at whatever time seemed to him most fitting. The Republican Deputies, who in this business case to have had the assistance of the Carlist members, fought the project with desperation, but after a continuous sitting of two days and a half, it was carried on Friday evening. The news of the passage of the bill caused great excitement in Madrid, and a demonstration against the Ministry which the police had some difficulty in suppressing.

It is practically a municipal coup d'état of which SAGASTA has been guilty. He has, for a time to be determined by his arbitrary will, wrested from the plundered taxpayers of Madrid the constitutional weapon, the right to elect their representatives, and has thus, in a manner, rendered the law inoperative. A much less serious provocation gave rise to the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 in France. If the Republicans and Carlists between them do not turn to account the outburst of popular disgust and indignation, it will be because the standing army still feels a certain chivalrous sympathy for the widowed CHRISTINA and the child King, ALFONSO XIII. There have, indeed, been rumors that this sentiment, which at one time exercised a powerful influence, has of late almost disappeared. We shall know in the course of a few days whether the garrisons of Madrid, Barcelona, and other large cities can be relied upon; and, with this, with the army, this took an active part in the overthrow of Isabella II. is now loyal. It would be curious if the Infanta EULALIA, on her arrival in New York, should learn that the dynasty she represents had ceased to reign in Spain.

The Struggle in Nicaragua.

There is a curious parallel between the events that called for American intervention along the line of the Panama Canal, just eight years ago, and those that are occurring in Nicaragua to-day.

Within two months after Secretary WHITNEY took charge of the Navy Department, during Mr. CLEVELAND's first term as President, he was compelled to hurry a naval force to Colon, on the Atlantic side of the Isthmus, and to the Pacific side of the Pacific side. In consequence of the revolution that had broken out in Colombia. The insurgents, under Gen. ALEXANDER, had made a sweep along the line of the interoceanic railway, and had seized Panama, while some of the frenzied followers of PRESTAN had set fire to Colon. With the lives and property of Americans thus endangered, transit across the Isthmus was blocked, and President TRUMAN occupied with the insurgents nearer his capital, who held Barranquilla and besieged Cartagena, our Government was called upon to act. Accordingly Admiral JOHNSON, in command of the Tennessee, the Swatara, the Alliance, and the Galena, was sent to Colon, and marines were despatched by steamer from New York. The result was the capitulation of ALEXANDER, and the collapse of the rebellion elsewhere soon followed.

A like necessity, coming upon Secretary HERRICK at the outset of his career in the Navy Department, has hurried the Atlanta to Greytown on the Atlantic coast of Nicaragua and the Alliance to Corinto on the Pacific coast, to guard American interests, particularly interoceanic transit or canal interests, during the insurrection now going on against President SAGASTA. The first question, therefore, is as to whether, in an emergency, we should have the right to intervene as decisively in Nicaragua as we did in Colombia. The instructions were that "the object of the expedition is the performance by the United States of their engagements to preserve the neutrality of, and keep open, the transit from Colon to Panama, and further to protect the lives and property of American citizens." In a telegram sent several weeks later he informed Admiral JOHNSON that "the object of the Colombian forces involv-

ing the destruction or embarrassment of the transit is in violation of their treaty with this Government. An armed contest at any place involving the same result is also a breach of the treaty." This last was thought to be a fair deduction from the stipulations of the treaty of 1846.

Now, our treaty of 1876 with Nicaragua expressly provides that the forces of the United States may be disembarked in the country and employed to protect the lives and property of our citizens on the interoceanic transit routes. The first stipulation in that Nicaragua, herself, "should it become necessary at any time to employ military forces for the security and protection of persons and property passing over any of the routes aforesaid, will employ the requisite force for that purpose." It is, however, the provision that follows which possesses interest at the present time:

"Not upon failure to do this by any cause whatever, the Government of the United States may, with the consent or at the request of the Government of Nicaragua, or of the latter thereof at Washington, or of the competent, legally appointed local authorities, civil or military, employ such force for this and for no other purpose; and when, in the opinion of the United States, the security cases, such force shall be immediately withdrawn."

In the exceptional case, however, of unforeseen and imminent danger to the lives or property of our citizens, the force of said republic are authorized to act for their protection without such consent having been previously obtained."

It is further stipulated that such intervention shall be "in pursuance of laws of Congress hereafter enacted," although such laws are not to affect "the protection and guarantee of the neutrality of the routes of transit, nor the obligation to withdraw the troops which may be disembarked in Nicaragua directly or indirectly, in the judgment of the United States, they should no longer be necessary." The substance of the matter is that a cause for landing a force of our blue-jackets and marines in Nicaragua, under the treaty, might undoubtedly arise.

Yet we do not think that it will arise at this time. There is a marked difference between the present revolution in Nicaragua and the one of 1855 in Colombia. The latter directly affected existing interoceanic transit, and pillage and incendiarism were rife at Colon. The revolt in Nicaragua not only led by men having large property interests, but certainly does not threaten either canal or interoceanic enterprises. It appears to be based on dissatisfaction at President SAGASTA's reelection, and also, apart from personal ambitions, on alarm, whether well or ill founded, at his financial policy. Without going into the merits of these matters, which are for the Nicaraguans themselves to decide, it is enough to note that the fate of the revolution will unquestionably be decided, and probably very soon, at a long distance from the canal route, and in the opposite corner of the republic from that of the canal headquarters at Greytown.

We may fairly expect that the simple presence of the Atlanta and the Alliance near the two ends of the canal will be sufficient for the purposes of our Government.

The chances are, therefore, that the political future of Nicaragua will be settled by its own people before the arrival of our ships at their destination.

What Did the Civil War Cost in Money?

This interesting question, often asked and never satisfactorily answered, comes before us once more. A conventional formula frequently employed by loose speakers and writers, is that the war of the rebellion cost the North a million lives and a billion of treasure. The statement is grossly inaccurate at both ends. The estimate of mortality is excessive, while the estimate of money expenditure is ridiculously inadequate.

The popular idea that a million soldiers of the Union lost their lives during the war, or directly in consequence of the war, is encouraged by many persons who know better, because it suggests such exaggerated notions of the magnitude of the struggle and the number of men actually engaged in military operations in the Northern armies, as to afford an argument or excuse for a pension system in which extravagance and dishonesty find plenty of room. The number of officers and men actually killed in battle in all of the Union armies during the four years of war, barely exceeds 60,000. The number of those who died of wounds during the war is less than 35,000. The number that died of disease, either resulting from the hardships and exposure of warfare, or the incident of natural mortality in a great body of men, is about 185,000 for the four years. Adding even the 24,000 cases of disappearance, conveniently charged in the records to death, we reach the number of men actually lost among the Union troops during the war is 304,000, or less than a third of the million supposed by many people to have perished on the battlefield.

The purpose of the present article is to put together some of the items of expenditure and loss clearly and directly chargeable to the war account; in other words, to establish a minimum estimate of the money cost of preserving the Union. If we were to go into the matter of consequential damages, such as the paralysis of certain branches of business, the suspension of trade with the Southern States, the extinction of a large part of our maritime commerce, the enormous loss resulting from the arrest of the normal increase of population and the peaceful development of the nation's resources, we should pass at once from the domain of precise arithmetic to that of vague conjecture and unverifiable speculation. That is not our intention. The figures presented below are only such as are afforded by the official records; or, where in the nature of things the amounts set down are mere estimates, the estimates shall be manifestly well within the bounds. The several classes of expenditure or direct loss to be considered are:

1. The current war expenses paid during the four years by the United States Government with money raised by taxation or borrowed upon the nation's credit.
2. The bounties paid to the volunteers during the war by the States, or from other sources than the Federal Government.
3. The money raised and expended by organizations of citizens for the alleviation of the soldiers' condition.
4. The direct loss to the nation's wealth, resulting from the employment in military service of citizens who otherwise would have been producers.
5. The war claims paid by act of Congress since the war, for the destruction of property, or for other reasons.
6. The interest on the war debt since 1865 up to the present time.
7. The expenditure for pensions to date.

The actual current war expenditure during the four fiscal years from June 30, 1861, to June 30, 1865, is easily ascertained. The net ordinary expenditure of the Government during that period was as follows:

would have spent if there had been no war. To separate the two items we have only to deduct as much as was actually spent for all purposes of Government during the period of four years immediately preceding the war. If it is said that under normal circumstances the country's growth would have increased the ordinary expenditure for 1865-1866 over that for the 1859-1860 period, it must be remembered that this possible increase was more than balanced by the restriction of the field of administration during the second period to the Northern and border States:

Fiscal year 1859.	\$73,982,493
Fiscal year 1860.	88,993,000
Fiscal year 1861.	93,500,000
Fiscal year 1862.	96,000,000
Total.	\$372,972,191

Deduct this from the total for the war period as above, and add the total paid by the Government in premiums for loans, an item not included in the statement of annual expenditure:

Expenditure for war period 1862-65.	\$1,348,572,183
Less allowance for peace expenditure.	93,076,548
Premiums on Government War loans.	60,429,890
Total.	\$1,315,065,745

The totals of local bounties paid to the several States to fill their quotas under the calls of 1863, 1864, and 1865 are obtained from the report for 1866 of Provost-Marshal-General JAMES B. FAY, whose official contributions to the statistical history of the war of the rebellion are of inestimable value. We omit from consideration any account of the money paid by States or towns or individuals, over and above the amount refunded from the United States Treasury, for the creditable equipment of the troops sent to the front. The total would be very large, but it is practically indeterminate. Much of the local bounty money was expended on uniforms, and it belongs in this account. One desperate character who was convicted and sentenced to the Albany Penitentiary confessed that he had drawn and jumped the bounty not less than thirty-twofold. The amount thus paid from the beginning to the end of the war in the loyal States or groups of States is shown in the following table:

The New England States.	\$52,676,002
New York.	86,429,237
New Jersey.	29,896,066
Delaware, Maryland, and Dist. of Col.	48,154,065
West Virginia and Kentucky.	1,557,814
Ohio.	28,246,235
Illinois.	37,296,205
Michigan.	6,964,855
Wisconsin, Iowa, Minn., Mo., and Kansas.	10,810,640
Total.	\$285,941,128

Throughout the North during the war there were not less than seven thousand local associations of patriotic men and women contributing money, time, and articles of every description to promote the well-being of the soldiers fighting at the front or to add to their comfort. Besides these local societies, there were such organizations as the Sanitary Commission and the Christian Commission, operating on a large scale and in the general field. The Sanitary Commission alone raised and expended more than \$20,000,000. The aggregate of these contributions of associated or individual patriotism, from the society of little girls who sold their gold rings and lockets for the benefit of the wounded soldier, to the capitalist who equipped a regiment at his own expense or gave a steamship to LINCOLN's Government, can never be computed. When we set it down at \$50,000,000 for the purposes of this inquiry, we are making a very low estimate.

A large item properly belonging to the cost of the war is the loss to productive industry of the time and labor of the citizens who enlisted in the army or the navy, or who were otherwise engaged in the war effort. The number of volunteers in service at the various times designated is shown by this table:

January 1, 1862.	613,818
January 1, 1863.	892,728
January 1, 1864.	836,101
January 1, 1865.	1,077,441
May 1, 1865.	958,417
Average.	847,701

If we take \$47,701 as the average number of men in the Union armies during the war, and estimate the earning capacity of the average soldier at \$300 a year above the cost of his own subsistence, the direct loss occasioned by the diversion from productive to unproductive labor would amount to \$234,310,300 a year, or for the four years of the war period, to \$1,017,241,200.

It would be the work of a lifetime to either out the whole amount paid since the war, and general acts of Congress, in compensation for the loss or alleged destruction of property, or for war supplies seized or furnished, or for indemnity for loss of personal effects, or for back pay or bounty of volunteers, or for horses or mules lost, or for the reimbursement of States or minor civil divisions for expenditures necessitated by the war, or in any other of the countless ways in which the war still draws upon the Treasury. For thirty years the investigation of these war claims preliminary to the appropriation of money for their payment, has constituted a large and exacting part of the labors of Congress; and in the later years, of the Court of Claims. The items, great and small, which would have to be considered by one by one, at any attempt at exact ascertainment of the cost, are almost innumerable. They are scattered throughout the Treasury books in multitudinous shapes. They are contained in the Army and Navy Appropriation bills, in the Sundry Civil, in the Miscellaneous, in the Deficiency, and elsewhere. Our estimate of the grand aggregate of these appropriations is entirely arbitrary. Supposing that the war claims allowed and paid by the Government since 1865 have averaged only \$5,000,000 a year, the total would be \$20,000,000. That is the sum which we charge to this item; if it were doubled, we should consider that we were still well within the bounds of probability.

The interest paid on the war debt can be stated accurately. The gradually decreasing annual payments on this account before the fiscal year 1866, are shown above. Since 1865 they have been as follows:

Fiscal year.	Fiscal year.
1866.	\$138,067,825
1867.	143,781,597
1868.	143,044,094
1869.	136,864,248
1870.	129,325,498
1871.	125,576,980
1872.	117,367,540
1873.	104,750,098
1874.	107,319,815
1875.	103,005,545
1876.	100,343,271
1877.	97,124,032
1878.	102,500,676
1879.	105,827,949
Total since the war.	\$2,365,826,102

The pension expenditure on account of the war of the rebellion, which has been steadily as the interest charge has diminished. The annual totals, as stated below, include pensions paid on account of the Mexican war and the earlier wars, and we have therefore made a deduction for the same. As Mexican war veterans and veterans of the civil war were for years enrolled on the lists under the common head of army invalids, the allowance to be made for pensions paid on account of the war of the rebellion must be an estimate. We have assumed an average of \$4,000,000 annually, and have deducted from the grand total, \$112,000,000 on this account:

Fiscal Year.	Fiscal Year.
1866.	\$112,000,000
1867.	112,000,000
1868.	112,000,000
1869.	112,000,000
1870.	112,000,000
1871.	112,000,000
1872.	112,000,000
1873.	112,000,000
1874.	112,000,000
1875.	112,000,000
1876.	112,000,000
1877.	112,000,000
1878.	112,000,000
1879.	112,000,000
Total since the war.	\$1,120,000,000

Recapitulating these several items of expenditure, and omitting from consideration any of the other myriad sources of expense to the Government, we obtain a fair minimum estimate of what it cost the North to preserve the Union:

Current war expenses.	\$1,348,572,183
Bounties other than Federal.	285,941,128
Estimated private contributions.	50,000,000
Loss of soldiers' productive labor.	1,017,241,200
War claims allowed and paid.	20,000,000
Interest on war debt.	2,365,826,102
Pensions on account of civil war.	1,120,000,000
Total.	\$6,458,580,613

These figures stagger the imagination. Like all symbols for quantities so stupendous as to be far beyond the accustomed range of thought, they go from the mind without producing any mathematical impression. One million conveys the idea of vastness, one billion or a thousand millions conveys the idea of something vastly vaster; but the difference between one billion and eight billions is appreciated slowly, and only by an indirect process. What does it really mean, then, when we say that the money cost of the war to the North alone was nearly eight and a half billions of dollars?

To raise money enough to pay the bill in one lump sum, every voter in the United States would have to contribute more than \$600. If the burden were distributed among the whole earth's population, every human being, man, woman or child, civilized or savage, living anywhere on the face of the globe, would be taxed about six dollars. If every gold or silver coin or piece of paper money now in circulation among the four hundred million people of this country and of England, France, Germany, Austria, Holland, Italy, Spain, and Russia should be gathered in and counted, the total value reduced to United States money would cover only three-quarters of our war cost. The amount of money indicated by the figures, \$6,458,580,613, is more than five times the aggregate of the deposits in the 3,677 national banks of the United States; more than five times the aggregate of the savings banks of the United States; more than eight times the aggregate of deposits in all of the State banks, trust companies, and private banking concerns of the United States; almost double the aggregate of deposits in all of these institutions combined.

But there is a simpler and still more striking method of arriving at the significance of these figures. It cost the North \$6,458,580,613 to keep the Southern States in the Union. By the census of 1860 the estimated valuation—true valuation, not assessed—of all property, real and personal, in these eleven States was as follows:

Virginia.	\$768,249,681
North Carolina.	558,739,369
South Carolina.	544,338,754
Georgia.	645,325,237
Florida.	73,191,500
Alabama.	410,237,018
Mississippi.	607,254,011
Louisiana.	604,516,568
Texas.	805,200,614
Arkansas.	219,254,473
Tennessee.	403,003,893
Total wealth of the eleven States.	\$5,202,194,207

Thus it appears that, in order to keep these eleven States under the flag, the nation has paid at least \$3,232,018,406 more than the entire valuation of all property in those eleven States at the time when the war was fought. But the war for the Union was fought for an idea, and the idea was worth all it has cost.

Belman, Spare Those Relics!

Even patriotism can be carried beyond the point of moderate exaltation. The National Columbian Liberty Bell, which seems to have reached the dithyrambic and fanatical stage. Somebody conceived the idea of a National Columbian Liberty Bell to be cast in part from metal articles of historical interest in the various States and Territories. Anything from GEORGE WASHINGTON's silver shoe buckles to the pennies of schoolboys will be accepted gratefully, and due record of the offering kept for the instruction or amusement of the times to come. The bell is to be cast at Troy, June 8, and it will be exhibited at Chicago until the close of the Fair and then removed to Washington. "Its object," says the estimable lady who is the Virginia member of the National Liberty Bell Committee, "is to celebrate the annals of great men and measure the progress of the Republic, and to show the independence, apart from all parties and sections."

A most worthy object, but not to be attained by sacrificing relics and memorials of those great men, or of any great men or events. The Virginia member has contributed a brass door knob made by THOMAS JEFFERSON in his workshop at Monticello, a key to PATRICK HENRY's desk, the rings from the scabbard of a sword worn at Culoden, and so on. The place for things like these is a museum or a historical society. They are treasures which ought to be preserved, treasures which fused indistinguishably into a big bell cease to have value or interest. If the persons who are contributing metals for the Liberty Bell are as generous as this Virginia lady, many precious mementos of colonial, revolutionary, and State history will be wasted and lost irrevocably. Now, while there may be a fair trade in bogus articles of this sort, the number of genuine relics is not so great that a wanton destruction of many or any of them will not be felt and in time repeated. Of the United States have been as absorbed in the present and the future that the memorials of their past have not been kept as they should be. Particularly has this been the case with buildings of historical interest. Societies and associations now exist which make it their special business to do all in their power to collect and preserve the monuments and memorials of American history in all its forms. It is a sad and sorry state of a country that does not value such monuments and memorials. As time passes, any article which belonged to

a famous American or is associated with any great political or military or naval event, becomes of great value. The ultimate destination of such articles should be a public museum. Meanwhile, the fortunate owners of such relics are free, of course, to do what they please with them; but to see them destroyed from a mistaken sense of patriotism, thrown away in a moment of sentimental exuberance, dumped ignominiously into a bell foundry, must grieve the judicious mind as much as it may tickle the cynical. It is very fine, no doubt, to read of the matrons and maids of the high old Roman fashion who threw their necklets and their armlets, their jewels, rings, and ocher, jingling on the marble floor when their country was invaded; but there are better ways than that "to come to the aid of the Treasury" nowadays, nor is the woman of America bold and jangled that the women of America need to show their patriotism by offering up their great-grandfather's silver buttons and brass coffin plates on the altars of windy Troy. If the Columbian Liberty Bell should be a cento of relics, what would it profit in sound thereby? Copper and tin are good enough to make a bell of; in fact, there is nothing better. The sword of Bunker Hill and the brass clasps from your big old King JAMES Bible, containing the Apocrypha and family record, will not help the tone a bit.

The Columbian Liberty Bell, if built according to specifications, will be noisy enough, we dare say, but the sound will be of the tolling. Inscribed on such a bell should be the *funera plango* of the medieval bell, "I mourn the relics ruined." We wonder why some genius should not propose that Independence Hall and Faneuil Hall and Mount Vernon be torn down and made into a composite shed and turret for the Columbian Liberty Bell. If there are ears that yearn for more diaphanous in copper and zinc, the dysphonies must be provided for them; but surely neither Columbia nor Liberty demands the destruction of historical relics for the purpose of making a bell and clapper. Melt up your tins, Columbian patriots, if you will, and come down with your tin for the bell, but let the relics alone!

A Trust Estate.

The trust funds which FRANCIS H. WEEKS held for the benefit of Mrs. GRIFFITH, and which she now charges him with having misappropriated, are a part of the great estate of the original JOHN JACOB ASTOR, and they have been held in trust almost uninterruptedly for nearly fifty years.

In 1829 JOHN BRISTED married a daughter of JOHN JACOB ASTOR. He was an Englishman of a university education who came to New York in 1806, and after practicing as a lawyer for several years, entered the Episcopal ministry, in which he remained until his death in 1855, or seven years after the death of his father-in-law. Mr. Astor left considerable property in trust for the benefit of Mrs. BRISTED and her son, CHARLES ASTOR BRISTED, the estate to go in fee to the children of this son.

The younger BRISTED was graduated at Yale, and subsequently at Cambridge, in England, and early in his manhood he discovered literary capacities which made his customary signature, CARL BENSON, well known as that of an author of much versatility and some eccentricity. In 1847 he married a daughter of the late HENRY BREVOORT, whose large and old-fashioned house in the lower Fifth avenue still remains as a relic and a reminder of the wealth, the state, and the fashion of New York of a past generation. By her he had one son, named after his grandfather, JOHN JACOB ASTOR, and after her death he married Miss GRACE SEABROOK of Lenox, by whom he had one son also. The property in which he and a life partner, descended in fee to those two sons, and the funds which FRANCIS H. WEEKS is accused of dissipating constituted a large part of the share of the first.

JOHN JACOB ASTOR BRISTED died in 1882, leaving a will by which he trusted nearly one-half of his estate for the benefit of CHARLES BRISTED, his foster sister, who has since become Mrs. GRIFFITH, the principal to go to her children. This will was contested by the guardian of the other son, then a minor, on the ground of the mental incompetency of the testator, but the suit was compromised and withdrawn. Mr. WEEKS was the sole surviving trustee, and, as Mrs. GRIFFITH is altogether ignorant of business, and had absolute confidence in both his capacity and honor, he was unhampered in the management of an estate of about \$325,000, except by his own conscience.

The trust which Mrs. GRIFFITH reposed in him was not greater than that reposed by Mr. CHARLES ASTOR BRISTED and his son, Mr. WEEKS also enjoyed the confidence of many men distinguished for their good judgment and financial sagacity; and in society generally and in the Church nobody stood better than he. His unusual qualifications to be a trustee of Mrs. GRIFFITH's property would have been asserted by officers of leading trust companies to whom she might have gone. If at any time she had felt any doubt of him; yet it appears from her affidavit that for years past WEEKS has been paying her only about one-half of her actual income; and the other disclosures now made concerning his business management indicate that for a long time he has been open to reasonable suspicion.

A Question Christians Cannot Debate.

A branch of the Christian Endeavor Society discussed this question the other night in a Harlem Presbyterian church:

"What should be the Christian's attitude toward the use of intoxicants as a beverage?"

The proper attitude of a Mohammedan toward this practice is not open to debate. It is determined by the law of MOHAMMED, absolutely forbidding the use of intoxicating beverages. Under the law of CHRIST, however, each individual is empowered to settle the question for himself, with due regard to the great principle that he use his personal liberty without offense to the general good. With the people of Jesus Himself before them, Christians cannot consistently condemn the use of intoxicating beverages as sinful. If the Author of Christianity used His miraculous power to change water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana for the delectation of the assembled guests, His followers are debarred from treating the drinking of such alcoholic stimulants as contrary to the law and precept of Christianity. It is an historical fact, as recorded in the New Testament, that JESUS Himself was a drinker of wine and an encourager of its use as a beverage. Hence by His example he determined the attitude of Christians toward "intoxicants," so that there is no possibility of debate regarding it. The question discussed in the Harlem Presbyterian church was accordingly not open to debate by Christians. It has been already settled by the supreme authority, and only those who deny and reject that

authority can properly find fault with the decision. It was a question for infidel debate, not for Christian.

The Grand Duke ALEXANDER of Russia, the Duke DE VERAGUA of Spain, the Vice-Admirals and commanders of the foreign cruisers in our waters—New York has never until the month of May, 1893, had the opportunity of welcoming so many distinguished visitors. Then we expect very soon to welcome here the daughter of a Queen, the Infanta EULALIA, and the grandees by whom she is to be accompanied. If the German Emperor were not bothered with the Army bill, the Reichstag, the elections, the humbug ALEXANDER, and the imperial progeny, we might have a chance of catching a sight of him in this city.

It is to be hoped that Dr. MCGILVER will either go to Rome, or let us know for certain if he is going, or give some positive assurance to mankind that he will not go, or, any other way, settle the matter. He has been here for some time, and he has been getting ready to go, or considering whether, after all, he really ought to go, week after week, for ten months. He keeps all the papers of the country fully informed of his mental motions toward Rome, and away from it. We saw last week, when he was here, that he had sent an inquiry whether he could obtain an audience with the Pope. We also learn from Rome that he has sent notice there that he still holds the opinions which led to all his troubles here, and very fantastic opinions they are. If MCGILVER is to be here, he should at least let us learn that he is a bigger man in New York than he is in Rome, and can talk louder in Cooper Institute than in the Vatican.

Commissioner SENNER is justified in adopting all lawful means of keeping out of this country such immigrants as are provided for by the laws of the United States. His conduct during the past week in the enforcement of the orders of the Treasury Department at Ellis Island has been justifiable and proper. Until these orders were applied on Thursday many undesirable immigrants passed the inspectors; it will hereafter be possible, though hard, to keep out such immigrants.

The mazurka, a national Russian dance of Polish origin, was danced at the ball given on Friday in honor of the Grand Duke ALEXANDER of Russia. It is not likely that the fandango, which is the national dance of Spain, will be the ball to be given in honor of the Spanish Infanta EULALIA.

A particularly neat piece of business has been transacted under the direction of Health Officer JENKINS. Dr. JENKINS found that a case of cholera had been brought to this city from Bremen on the steamship Lahn. As soon as he ascertained that the affected passenger, before sailing for this country, had stayed for a time in a certain lodging house in Bremen, he telegraphed the fact to the Surgeon-General, who immediately cabled instructions to the visiting health officer in Bremen, that the house must be fumigated and disinfected before any more of its occupants were permitted to depart for the United States. There need not be any doubt that the order given in this country will be obeyed in Germany. We say that this is a neat piece of business; and the visiting health officer in Bremen deserves commendation for his prompt action.

The Brooklyn *Chronicle*, which has been published every morning in Brooklyn for the past three months, gives up the ghost. We do not know how many more have tried and failed to establish a morning paper in Brooklyn during the past forty years. It is a queer thing that the Brooklyn people will not read a morning journal printed in Brooklyn. *THE SUN*, which is got out in New York